

Hermes

*By the Students and Faculty of
Wesleyan University, Middletown, CT*

Which Way Wesleiana?

September 21, 1982



Photo by Anne Gault/HERMES

Occupation at Hampshire

By John Ely

Five days after the Wesleyan sit-in began last May, a protest began at Hampshire College that was even more substantial and politically potent. While the April 29 Coalition at Wesleyan initiated the sit-in at North College to demand the reinstatement of an aid blind admissions policy, the Hampshire students began a serious occupation for different reasons.

Catching the tide of the growing disarmament movement in New England this last spring, the Hampshire student body voted 950 to 20 in favor of a Nuclear Resolution Freeze. With the support of 79 out of 95 faculty persons, Hampshire students organized a coalition entitled "Students for a Responsible Institution" (SRI). SRI was founded with the intention of making Hampshire College responsible in action for its role in military expansion and nuclear escalation. The group issued a statement addressed to the administration and the trustees demanding that Hampshire divest all holdings in weapons-producing corporations among the top 100 defense contractors.

The students' demands were promptly rejected by the trustees. Soon afterwards, more than thirty students began a occupation of the entire first floor of Hampshire's administration building, including the President's office, the offices of the Dean of Students and the Dean of Faculty, the Housing Center, and the Registrar's office. The students immediately issued a second, more extensive series of demands with the following introduction:

We recognize the systematic connection between militarism, racism, and sexism. Militaristic spending policies and attitudes deprive historically and presently oppressed groups of resources, civil rights life. Just as these militaristic priorities are being set on a national level, so they are being set at Hampshire. The Trustees' refusal to divest from weapons-producing corporations is part of the same attitude that informs the Administration's limited support of socially responsible policies within Hampshire. We see the existence of the Women's Center, the Day Care Center, campus accessibility for disabled people and the Counselor Advocacy program as crucial to the quality of life at Hampshire as well as to the development of a feminist, anti-racist curriculum.

The Demands

The major demand following this prologue, was for immediate divestment of stock holdings in the leading arms manufacturers. The students' second demands was that the college "create a task force to establish guidelines for socially responsible investment." The task force was to consist of 50 percent students, 25 percent faculty and staff, and 25 percent administration and trustees. In this demand, SRI also called for a general meeting of the Hampshire community as the first task force meeting. They also insisted that students must be involved in the future in determining the college's investment managers. SRI's third demand stated that "the Administration must draft and release a press statement addressing the connections between militarization, increased military spending and cuts in financial aid and other social services." Here they called another general meeting of the Hampshire community to allow the administration to explain the college's strategies for addressing these cuts.

In the initial list, there were five other major

demands, including: building space on campus for the Alternative Learning Program; a serious commitment to address feminist, environment and anti-racist issues in the curriculum and campus services; and a final eye opening demand for the exploration of alternative forms of administration that would make the Board of Trustees more accountable to the students.

Students Break In

The occupation was a serious undertaking, and literally closed down the most vital administrative functions at Hampshire. It began early in the morning, on May 17, facilitated by an errant key to the single entrance of the administrative building. Once inside, the thirty students chained the doors from the inside, blocking off the only way in (all the windows were permanently closed). SRI decided to occupy this particular area because it was one of the major focuses of power at Hampshire.

continued on page 10

John Ely / '83 participated in the May '82 Wesleyan sit-in.

Russell Ford Speaks

From Russ Ford, August 30th, 1982:

I'm here in prison having refused to sign a \$10,000 bond in court. I was in court having refused to sign a piece of paper some group called Selective Service had sent me. I've written the judge explaining I would promise to come back for trial, but was just unhappy about the money part. They are putting me on trial in the first place because I wrote to that Selective Service explaining that I wouldn't promise to show up for a war, I was unhappy about the 'support your local government—kill its enemies' part.

So maybe the judge will let me out of jail on my promise to come back to court to explain why I won't promise the Selective Service that I'll come when they call me for war.

All this started when I wrote the government saying how I figure murder is wrong, war is a function of government (On later reflection I thought maybe I had it backwards: government is a function of war), and that war is murder. In a Euclidian system the conclusion to be drawn from these statements is that war is wrong and that government is murder. Unfortunately, the government claims I'm wrong, and has me in its jail for the specific crimes of being anti-government, and anti-warrior, and a non-murderer. So much for logic and Euclidian systems. Shades of Lewis Carroll.

For more from Russell Ford, see pp. 6-7.

This Year's Harvest



The Good Harvest, located on Main Street, is one of Middletown's great food vnderies, along with O'Rourke's.

By Anne Wheeler and Mary Purpura

Wesleyan students returning to Middletown may have been puzzled by some changes at the Good Harvest Cooperative Food Store. (For those of you unfamiliar with the Good Harvest, it carries only whole or minimally processed foods at competitive prices. Although you won't find meat, fish, or junk food at 686 Main Street, you will find a preference to selling local goods, including produce, eggs, and honey.) These changes include a deli counter in

the works—to be unveiled around mid-October. The counter will make shopping far easier at the Good Harvest: the staff member or volunteer behind the counter will cut cheeses as well as dispense liquid bulk items and homemade salads according to the customer's wishes.

The most far-reaching change, though, affects membership policy. In the past, members payed yearly dues based on their ability to pay. Now, to become a member for a year, you can select one of three options: pay \$15.00; work four hours at the store, or buy \$10.00 worth of groceries per week for six weeks.

Once you become a member, you're eligible to elect the Good Harvest board, to vote at annual membership meetings, and to pre-order in bulk. In addition, as a member, you express support for a cooperative, community-based food store.

Before the store's policy changed, all members who worked two hours each month received a 10 percent discount off marked prices. Now, members can apply to become "working members." These members work three hours per month and receive an 8 percent discount on the food they buy. Non-working members—as well as non-members—pay

marked prices. (Marked prices have been reduced on everything except vitamins, spices and body care items to accomodate this policy change.)

Presently, the Good Harvest staff has spots for 120 working members. These spots will be filled by individuals who have demonstrated a commitment to the store. In addition, non-students must number among the 120 so the store has a core of year-round workers. The past unreliability of working members is partly responsible for the present limitation on their number.

To ensure smooth-running of the store, two of the five staff members (some of whom were formerly called coordinators) are present at all times. According to staff member Wendy Liebman, one future goal is to have three staff in the store at all times. This will not be possible until a sixth person has been hired. Present staff members are: Art Oxnard, Marybeth Olander, Blane Hurie, and Wendy Liebman. William Fuller will join the staff shortly.

The Good Harvest, formerly run by a Steering Committee, is now run by a board of seven members. Three are elected from the membership and four from the staff. Elections for the membership portion of the board are now in process.

Most members realize that past financial woes have made these changes necessary at the Good Harvest. Still, reactions to the new policies haven't all been positive. "We've lost a lot of members as a result of these changes," says Liebman. "Some people are suspicious about the staff's intentions; they think we're trying to acquire more power. The fact is these changes are essential for the survival of the Good Harvest." ■

Anne Wheeler/ '84 and Mary Purpura/ '83½, are both active members of the Good Harvest Food Co-op.

Letter

Arnold Alpert, Wesleyan Class of '77
114 Garvin's Falls Rd.
Concord, NH 03301

Jim Kates, Wesleyan Class of '67
45 Old Peterboro Rd.
Jaffrey, NH 03452

August 13, 1982

U.S. Attorney Alan H. Nevas
PO Box 1824
New Haven, Ct 06508

Dear U.S. Attorney Alan Nevas,

We are probably too old to be drafted should the government begin inductions. We are not, however, too old to oppose the draft and to aid those who resist it.

Secretary of Defense Caspar Weinberger has said that the United States should plan to prevail in an all out nuclear war, a concept which sane people find meaningless. He has also said the U.S. should be prepared to fight "in wars of any size and shape and in any region where we have vital interests," a statement that might refer to wars to "protect" the Mideast oil fields, or wars to defend the brutal governments of El Salvador or Guatemala from their own people.

We understand you have indicted Russell Ford of Middletown for failing to register for the draft. Although neither one of us have met Russell, we feel a special bond with him as we are both graduates of Wesleyan University where he is a student. We support Russell's principled refusal to kill and his resistance to the draft. We are willing to "aid and abet" others who conscientiously refuse to register or refuse to be drafted.

In an age when nuclear weapons can destroy the earth within an hour, we believe we all must take responsibility for the prevention of war and for the active search to find nonviolent methods of resolving conflicts between nations and between people. We know you have the authority to drop the prosecution. We hope that you will appreciate Russell's deeply held beliefs and do so.

Truly yours,

Arnold Alpert
Jim Kates

cc: Russell Ford
Middletown Press
Wesleyan Argus
Wesleyan Hermes

Join the Resistance Campaign to SHUT DOWN Selective Service Headquarters in Washington, D.C. October 18th

A weekend-long, multi-approached protest to registration and the draft.

On Sunday, Oct. 17th:	On Monday, Oct. 18th:
*A Worship Service	*Non-violent Civil
*Cultural-Political	Disobedience blockading the entrance to the Selective Service Headquarters
*Non-violent Civil Disobedience Training	*Combined with a larger, legal picket

Endorsed by: Mass Open Resistance (MOB); National Resistance Committee; UMASS (Amherst) Students Against Militarism; D.C. Peace Center; Upstate Resistance and Others



Better Late than Never

Due to technical difficulties, **Hermes** publication was delayed two days this week. Sorry—it won't happen again.

September

Kiosk

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Tues. September 21
4:30 The Women's Studies Collective
basement of 285 Court Street (the English Department)

Thurs. September 23
6:30 Jugglers for Social Change
The Field House

7:30 The Hunger Action Project
137 Science Center
for information: Anne Eustis Box 1099 or
344-0068

Starting with our next issue HERMES is going to publish an extensive announcements section. We invite both Wesleyan and Middletown organizations to submit schedules of their meetings and events. We also plan to introduce a section featuring reports from campus and local groups.

Announcements and reports can be delivered to the HERMES, at the second floor of the Housing office, where there is an envelope marked "Hermes Announcements." Groups with announcements can also call 346-9698. The next deadline for group reports and announcements will be Thursday September 13th.

Hermes Subscriptions

This year Hermes is going to start taking mail subscriptions from alumni and other interested persons. We are also interested in exchanging publications and newsletters from various other alternative groups to facilitate networking. Hermes comes out while school is in session (from Sept. to May) with 10-12 issues annually. Exchanges will be mailed at no cost, and regular subscriptions will be \$3.25 to cover mailing costs. Those with liberal guilt or Robin Hood talents are welcome to become contributors (\$6.00 or more). This helps defray production costs and expand the scope of the paper. Subscriptions inquiries should be sent to:

Hermes
Box A
Wesleyan Station
Middletown CT 06457



HELP WANTED

HERMES is looking for a business and advertising manager. Makes lots of money and help a good cause. Call 346-2090 for more information.

Hermes

Staff:
Melissa Ehn
Debbie Eagles
David Hamburger
Dawn Mandelman
Philippa Nye
Bill Pendergast
Peter Shabecoff
Paul Shread
Andrew Ulrich
David Weber
Jean Weifle
Ben Wenograd
Bill Walk

Editorial Collective:

Anne Canty
John Ely
Steve Hubbell
Matthew Lyons
Mary Purpura
Anne Wheeler

Special thanks to Alfredo Surescum, and to all our typesetters—You kept the presses rolling.

The Middletown Community Health Center

Started in the early '70s as a free clinic in a Middletown storefront, the Community Health Center now offers a variety of programs and services to Middlesex County through its Medical, Dental and Social Services components, all of which operate on a sliding fee scale. The Center's philosophy is based on a program of prevention and education, while underscoring the patients' involvement with and personal responsibility for their own health.

Located at 635 Main Street in the North end of town, the Center's medical staff provides health care including routine physicals, immunizations, family planning and gynecological services. The Center's dental component offers oral examinations, cleaning, filling, x-rays, root canals, dentures and surgery. The Social Service Component offers individual counseling and Family Services outreach, dealing primarily with problems of domestic violence and child abuse as well as making referrals to other area agencies.

New Horizons, a shelter for battered women, is also operated under the direction of the Health Center. The shelter operates a 24-hour hotline and offers temporary housing to women and children who have been abused or victimized in their own homes.

American Jews Who Question Israel ...and the Problems They Face

By Deborah Elkin

This article was written by Debbie last May, before the Israeli invasion of Lebanon

This article is a discussion of the difficulties that American Jews face when we want to publicly oppose Israeli government policies. In particular, I'm interested in American Jews who oppose Israeli policy from the left, those who generally advocate greater efforts towards opening discussions with Palestinians and who support Palestinian self-determination. The discussion is divided into four parts. It begins with some questions posed by the Holocaust and the creation of Israel. The second part explores the conflicts within an individual American Jew that make public dissent difficult. The third concerns Breira, an American Jewish organization formed in 1973 to try to open up discussion about alternatives to Israeli policy. And the fourth is a discussion of attacks on Breira, its demise, and some recent developments.

I
The Holocaust and the creation of the state of Israel in 1948 led to a number of conflicts for Jews all over the world, and American Jews in particular. As the most horrifying example of Christian anti-semitism, the Holocaust fanned the flames of fear. The question of Jewish survival became a real one.

What is the best means to ensure Jewish survival? Especially after the Holocaust, many Jews felt that a Jewish state was necessary to ensure our survival. This is the idea of Zionism.

Zionism had been developing before the Nazis, and there are many different forms of Zionists, from those that consider themselves socialist, and want to see a Palestinian state on the West Bank, to those who believe that Israel should be an orthodox religious state occupying both sides of the Jordan River. But Zionists share in common the nationalist commitment to a Jewish state as essential to Jewish survival.

The Holocaust gave a tremendous impetus to the creation of Israel. Many Jews fleeing Europe were restricted from entering the United States and other countries. The Holocaust lent support to the feeling that anti-semitism might never be rooted out of the world, so that the only safety for Jews might lie in a country of their own.

There is an irony in this: Israel justifies the present conflict between Israel and the Arabs by referring to the Holocaust. Begin's slogan is "Never Again." But the Holocaust was the result of Christian anti-semitism. Ironically, Jews under Islamic rule for many centuries fared much better than under Christian rule; the Jewish-Arab conflict is a recent historical development.



graphic by Debbie Elkin

II
There are other answers to the question of what can best ensure Jewish survival. One answer is to fight for the rights of Jews to live as equals in the countries where we already live. A variant on this answer is that nationalism is not a solution; instead, we should try to end capitalism and replace it with socialism. This view sees class conflict as the most fundamental breeder of tensions that will always cause people to look for scapegoats like Jews or Blacks.

But—the state of Israel now exists. Given this fact, even those Jews like me who do not see nationalism as an answer have to consider that Jews are there, and to include those Jews in the question of what will best ensure the survival of all Jews.

There are three major factors inside an individual American Jew that make it difficult to publicly oppose Israeli policy: fear of anti-semitism; anger at Israel's betrayal of what we consider to be Jewish tradition; and guilt over being in America rather than in Israel.

We fear public discussion of why Israel treats the Palestinians so terribly because we fear to provide an excuse for Christians to be anti-Jewish. We are afraid that Christians who feel guilty about the Holocaust, but who resent the Jews for making them feel guilty, will jump at the opportunity to be anti-Jewish, which we fear might ultimately lead to another Holocaust. We fear that Christians might champion the Palestinian cause but ignore the question of Jewish survival. These Christians may have no more love for the Palestinians than they have for the Jews, but Palestinians are farther away and so, less troublesome.

The Holocaust has also led to a feeling of an inevitable and eternal division of "Them" against "Us" that Begin, as well as his American Jewish supporters, seems to be acting on. This leads some of us to ask if it isn't a self-fulfilling prophecy to support the Israeli government's policies. We speak out of fear, too—fear that Israeli policy diminishes the chances of Jewish survival.

Anger, rooted in a feeling of betrayal, also makes it difficult to launch an effective criticism of Israeli policy, in two ways. The first is that an opposition fueled only by anger leads to a position that treats Israel as a monolith, that does not distinguish between current policy and future possibilities, and that ignores the people and groups within Israel that support discussions

with the PLO and self-determination for the Palestinians. As Anthony Lewis wrote in the New York Times of April 29,

"Too often, these days, it is assumed that a super-nationalist zealotry is all there is to Israel. That is an insult to a complicated country. Those who want peace and security more than territory deserve a hearing, too."

Anger at Israel's treatment of the Palestinians can also lead an American Jew to feel, "I don't want to be continued on page 7

Facing the War On Peace and Breaking the Law

By Phillipa Nye

Organizers, participants, the press; everyone agreed that the Nuclear Freeze peace rally in New York City on June 12th was a great success. Between 700,000 and a million people came, made their statement without antagonism, and spread a lot of good feelings along the way. The rally was not mournful, but there was an underlying seriousness of purpose, even a sense of urgency amongst some. By all accounts, even amongst police and politicians it was considered the perfect peace rally.

Two days later there was another type of demonstration in the city, a blockade of the missions to the United Nations of the five countries with nuclear arsenals. Like those at June 12, the 200 or so people who took part in this protest came from many different political and religious organizations, and represented a variety of ages and racial groups. They had all attended training sessions for non-violent protesting, and had all agreed to the ground rules, which were to be that no-one would engage in any verbal or physical abuse during the action. Unlike the June 12th rally, however, this one took protesting a step further. The stated demand was complete disarmament—immediately—and the goal was to shut down the missions for the day. This symbolically halted government "business as usual", that is the business of making life-threatening weapons. To demonstrate their seriousness, and the urgency of their cause, these people were willing to risk their bodies, block the missions, and defy the law. Nearly 5000 police officers were on duty and 1700 protestors were arrested. Yet the atmosphere lacked the expected tension, and while the blockades were for the most part effective, there were no angry confrontations and few, if any, injuries.

After participating in both protests, and listening to the media and my friends' reactions, I was struck by a dismaying contrast. Both were powerful and inspiring in their different ways, and yet while the first was highly praised, the second was looked upon with deep suspicion. Advance police reports of the 14th civil disobedience said that violence was expected, in spite of the obviously non-violent orientation of the par-

ticipants. Hence many of the marchers at the rally no doubt looked on the planned blockade with disapproval or ambivalence. By the same token, many participants in the 14th action were less than impressed with the earlier one, thinking its demands were watered down, or that its organizers cooperated too much with the police.

These attitudes reflect both a failure to recognize the validity of different methods of protest. It also reflects fragmentation and intolerance within the disarmament movement which, while it is understandable among a group motivated by strong beliefs and feelings, is neither beneficial nor necessary. A sense of unity in purpose is sorely needed, one which recognizes the same goal.

Emphasizing the urgency of efforts to end the arms race is unnecessary. The human race is not indestructible: we do possess the power and the fallibility necessary to destroy ourselves. At the same time, the power structure of this country so confuses and fragments us that we become removed from any autonomy or responsibility for our own lives. This flaw is augmented on a national scale, by a government which blindly places faith in technological expertise rather than seeking wisdom.

So we must take back our capability to make our own choices. This empowerment is a creative process, and as such should involve both individual and collective strength and action. There can be as many different methods as there are individuals or groups to act upon them. When change is needed, immediately and when other methods don't work, then it may become necessary to extend confrontation to tactics that are outside the law. At the point where protest becomes illegal, many people question its validity. This is perhaps an overly reverent, uncritical, view of law. Laws are not always designed to protect everyone's rights. There are many which are created to protect people's autonomy, and these should be respected. Then there are others which merely protect order and uniformity (not to mention the financial interest of the wealthy). These are the kinds of laws which can be broken and sometimes

should be, especially in a situation where the conduct of a government is not only "disorderly" but dangerous. This is the justification for civil disobedience. Civil disobedience in the form of blockades or occupations, draft or tax resistance, in any struggle against institutionalized insanity.

Any one method of protest cannot be judged solely in relation to any other since many are valuable. Successful social movements have usually involved a variety of approaches to highlighting and uprooting problems, a campaign of pressure from several different angles. Political pressure tactics can become just as institutionalized as the systems they are designed to change. The scene of the protestor-with-sign, in a crowd of other protestors, lined up in opposition to a crowd of police, or defense plant workers, each seeing each other as "the enemy", becomes needlessly antagonistic while at the same time boringly repetitive. Unless we see the conflict as between people and systems, policies or

conflict as between people and systems, policies or laws, rather than between people and people, then protest fails to be creative and just continues destructive patterns. This could become as much of a problem within the disarmament movement as anywhere else.

What seems most important in the creation of a sense of solidarity between people who are working for peace is a change in the criteria with which we assess our own efforts, and those of others working for the same goals. If taking charge of our personal futures is a fundamental part of making political changes, then in the final analysis we must depend on our personal and collective judgement of what methods rightly reflect a vision, rather than depending upon the dictates of law, custom, or imposed morality. ■

Phillipa Nye/ '86 was arrested in NYC at the June 14th action.

Moffet

By Daniel Taub

No wonder Connecticut voters are confused this year. In other Senate and Congressional races throughout America, voters will have little difficulty distinguishing the political ideologies of the candidates. One candidate might for example, proclaim himself to be the defender of the constitution against right wing assault, while his opponent sends a letter soliciting funds signed by Strom Thurmond, America's living symbol of racism and segregation.

Voters here are confused because while the above might represent an interesting contest pitting two candidates with starkly opposed ideologies, in Connecticut it is one man, Republican incumbent Lowell Weicker, who talks like a liberal at home and acts like a conservative in Washington. Many astute observers have called the fancy political footwork that produced this synthesis the "Weicker Waltz." Connecticut Democrats have surprisingly abandoned the defeatist "me-tooism" of the last several years to choose one of Washington's most outspoken, activist critics of Reaganomics, Toby Moffett.

The ideological differences between Weicker and Moffett are most starkly illustrated by their votes on the Reagan economic package. Weicker voted for the infamous trickle-down tax cut of 1981, opposing efforts supported by Moffett to concentrate cuts on middle-income and working people. The more puzzling aspects of Weicker's record (in view of his espoused liberalism) include his opposition to an amendment restoring \$6 million for child immunization programs, support of Reagan's plan to turn over to states through block grants the section of the Social Security Act which provides foster children with federal money to assist in their maintenance and adoption, and opposition to the restoration of funds for services for rape victims.

Moffett, however, spoke out forcefully against the redistribution of resources

from the poor and middle class to wealthy individuals and corporations perpetrated by the economic policy of the Republican Party.

In addition to tax and budget issues, Moffett differs from Weicker in his opposition to the 3rd component of the Reagan triad, the \$1.6 trillion military budget. Weicker voted for this, the largest defense budget in history, specifically supporting the B-1 Bomber.

Toby Moffett voted against this appropriation. He has opposed every military budget since his first election, in 1974, in order to protest a defense policy molded in corporate boardrooms and congressional cloakrooms. Moffett

to a peace-time economy. Weicker chooses merely to act the demagogue, playing upon the fears of Connecticut workers, thus retarding support for arms control and disarmament. In contrast, Moffett was one of the first congressmen to sign the nuclear freeze petition and is committed to soliciting support for it throughout the country.

On issues of direct concern to students, Moffett again has distinguished himself. Originally a teacher and later the first director of the Federal Office of Students and Youth, Moffett was one of 5 House members, and the only one not on the Education Committee to

Moffett's leadership on environmental issues (100 percent rating by League of Conservation Voters) as Chairman of the subcommittee on Energy, Environment and Natural Resources makes this Senate race one of the most important contests for the environmental movement. Moffett has played a key role in protecting the Clean Air and Water Acts. He has repeatedly called James Watt before his subcommittee to force the administration to obey pollution laws.

Lowell Weicker voted to confirm James Watt as Secretary of the Interior. And by Weicker's own admission, "I've not been strong on environmental issues...I'm not going to say I've carried the ball on that, such as, for example, Toby Moffett's carried the ball on that." (Hartford Advocate, 12/2/81)

Moffett's advocacy of solar energy and conservation and opposition to subsidies for nuclear power contrasts with Weicker's support for the Clinch River Breeder Reactor and other nuclear boondoggles. Moffett has held hearings pointing out the waste of tax dollars on these "pork barrel" political projects.

The preceding litany of votes pales in importance before one crucial vote that occurs every two years at the beginning of each session of the United States Senate. On that day, the Senate decides whether Strom Thurmond, Jesse Helms, Orrin Hatch, Jeremiah Denton and other right wing reactionaries will run the American legislative process from the chairmanship of important committees and subcommittees. Our Republican Senator, self proclaimed defender of legal abortion, feels that Strom Thurmond makes a better Judiciary Committee chairman than Ted Kennedy, and that Jeremiah Denton is just fine chairing the subcommittee on the Constitution. If the Republican party embodied by the sunbelt reactionaries is truly out to kill the social programs and constitutional guarantees that Weicker claims to support, he ought to get out of his party, because he helps perpetuate their power. With the Republicans in control of both the White House and Senate, Weicker must toe the conservative line on many basic issues. He is allowed his freedom to filibuster along with the

Daniel Taub/ '83 is active in the Moffet campaign.

continued on page 8



The challenger—with famous friend—at Wesleyan Promo-Concert.

feels that military spending ought to be subject to the same scrutiny and cost-effectiveness as social programs. Weicker is making Moffett's principled and courageous stand (in a state heavily dependent on defense contracts) into a major campaign issue.

Moffett, however, has sought to work with such firms as Pratt & Whitney to explore ways in which manufacturing jobs could be saved during a conversion

be singled out for special recognition by COPUS, the student lobby organization, which gave Moffett a 100 percent rating.

In contrast, one example of Senator Weicker's commitment to equal educational opportunity is his vote, on March 13, 1981, against restoring funds for Pell grants. The bill had been proposed in order to save the benefits for 600,000 students who otherwise could not afford to attend college.

A Tough Choice?

Weicker

By Mike Lewyn

Senator Lowell Weicker has, over his 12 years in the Senate, generally espoused a record of moderate liberalism. Over the past eight years, the Senator's ADA (Americans For Democratic Action, Washington's major liberal lobby) ratings have ranged from 55 to 75; his AFL-CIO ratings have ranged from 65 to 87. (Much of the reason for Weicker's slightly lower ADA ratings were because the ADA counts missed votes, etc, against legislators, unlike the AFL-CIO).

Below are some of his major positions:

REAGANOMICS— Generally opposed. Weicker was one of only ten senators to oppose President Reagan's \$36.9 billion package of budget cuts in April, 1981. He voted for some (though not most) individual budget cuts as part of political compromises made to secure more funds for education programs and other social programs. On March 11, 1981, he voted to lessen cuts in various

domestic programs by \$1.2 billion.

SMALL BUSINESS— Added a provision to the 1981 tax cut extending more of the cuts to small businessmen, as opposed to the big corporations who benefited from many of the other provisions of the tax cut.

SOCIAL PROGRAMS— On Dec. 19, 1981, Senator Weicker sponsored successful amendments to allocate an extra \$69.8 million for vocational rehabilita-

tion. He also helped rescue education programs from the Reagan "block grant" plan, under which money would be allocated directly to states to spend as they saw fit. Weicker teamed with Democrats on the Labor And Human Resources Committee to temper the assault of budget cutters on community health programs." (Hartford Courant July 5, 1982). Further, he opposes tuition tax credits.

CORPORATE BAILOUTS— Weicker opposed the Chrysler bailout. He also opposed the Reagan automobile import

restrictions, feeling that their major effect has been to raise auto prices without helping the US auto industry, an industry with problems caused less by foreign competition than by a declining domestic auto market (see Statistical Abstract, auto sales figures).

CIVIL LIBERTIES— John Shattuck (Washington's chief ACLU lobbyist) has termed Senator Weicker "the most effective civil rights advocate in the Senate" (CQ Weekly Report p. 465). Senator Weicker was (along with Senators Packwood and Baucus) the major force in the recent defeat of Senator Jesse Helms' "Human Life Bill", which would effectively overturn the 1973 Roe vs. Wade decision that legalized abortion. Weicker has also obstructed New Right attempts to do away with busing, judicial review, and the Supreme Court ban on school prayer. He also supports federally-funded abortions and ERA.

ENERGY— He supports the "neoliberal" approach of Senators Hart and Tsongas— decontrol of oil and natural gas prices, but only with fuel-assistance programs for the poor and probably a stiff windfall profits tax on the energy companies to finance energy and conservation programs. In the spring of 1981, he supported an amendment to shift funds from nuclear to solar energy, although he believes both to be necessary at the present time.

CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT TO BALANCE BUDGET— Opposed.

GUN CONTROL— Supports.

FOREIGN AND MILITARY POLICY— He opposed neutron bomb and MX missile, as well as the Stealth

continued on page 8

Mike Lewyn/ '83 is the historian for the Wesleyan College Republicans.



graphic by David Hamburger

Toby Moffett

continued from page 4

Democratic liberals because the Hatches and Thurmonds in congress know that there will always be liberals to filibuster, even without Weicker. They also know that he needs the exposure filibustering provides in order to get reelected and vote them back into their positions of power.

Weicker claims 12 years of seniority and membership in the ruling party provides effectiveness, something Moffett as a freshman would lack. If only this were true. Weicker is tolerated but not respected by his Republican colleagues. In fact, when the leadership appointed members to a conference committee dealing with conservation issues, Weicker, as chairman of the conservation subcommittee, was not even appointed! (Interestingly, Moffett was the only member of the Connecticut delegation to sit on that conference committee). Such a slight would be merely pathetic, if its repercussions for Connecticut residents were not so serious; we are burdened with perhaps the most ineffectual senator in Washington. Luckily, we have the opportunity to replace him with a senator who has the potential to be one of the most effective politicians in congress. A respected leader, Moffett won election from his colleagues to the chairmanship of the Environment subcommittee in his second term over two more senior members.

Although Moffett is an effective and

outspoken advocate on a variety of crucial issues perhaps his most important claim for progressive support lies in his vision of politics that transcends the day-to-day duties of a Senator. He articulates an agenda for transforming electoral politics that recognizes the importance of grass roots participation. He has stressed the need for Democrats to espouse a progressive philosophy that can help mobilize women's, environmental, consumer and freeze groups—to name a few—in support of a broad-based alternative to Reaganomics. He was the first director of the Connecticut Citizens Action Group (CCAG), which he built into a state-wide organization that was a national model for full-time citizen advocacy. He has continued this philosophical commitment to grass-roots participation and citizen involvement during this campaign. While Weicker proclaims that philosophy is unimportant and collects campaign funds from the oil companies he supports in Washington, Moffett organized a grass roots door-to-door canvas that reached hundreds of thousands of people, raising funds, signing up volunteers and educating voters on important issues. This effort signals the beginning of a transfer of political activity from the boardrooms to the streets, reaching disaffected and apathetic individuals and turning them into concerned political activists, or in the very least, angry voters.

There can be no better way to repudiate the cynical and manipulative politics of Lowell Weicker than by replacing him with a man dedicated to the transformation of the political process that has produced Reagan, Weicker and the Republican Senate. That man is Toby Moffett. ■

The Candidates' Ratings at a Glance

		A.D.A.	A.C.A.	AFL-CIO
1980	Lowell Weicker	72	43	81
	Toby Moffett	94	15	89
1979	Weicker	68	41	63
	Moffett	100	4	95

Americans for Democratic Action—(ADA)—liberal, civil libertarian
Americans for Constitutional Action—(ACA)—conservative
AFL-CIO—pro-labor

sources: Politics in America, The Almanac of American Politics, 1982

Lowell Weicker

continued from page 4

bomber (to which he prefers the B-1). He supports a bilateral nuclear freeze, and opposed military aid to El Salvador.

EFFECTIVENESS—Weicker feels that he'll be more effective than his opponent, because of his twelve years



seniority—he is third on the powerful Appropriations Committee; one of the Senators ahead of him will probably retire, another will be up for reelection in 1984 and will probably take a party leadership post in preference to the Chairmanship. Thus, he will probably be chairman of Appropriations or ranking Republican (an important position, especially since the ranking Democrat is economic conservative William Proxmire). Also, Weicker feels that his record, as outlined above, proves he has been effective in the past, as has his attendance at roll calls (89 percent as opposed to 75 percent for his Democrat opponent).

In sum, Weicker has generally been a liberal senator; though not a "100 percent liberal", he hopes to appeal to both moderates and liberals with his claim of greater seniority and effectiveness. Conservatives often oppose Weicker on this very ground; New Right leaders Richard Viguerie and Terry Dolan call Weicker "a leverage liberal" and have sponsored a right-wing third party candidate to drain votes away from Weicker and elect Weicker's major opponent, Congressman Moffett. Some would say this proves Weicker's effectiveness; Moffett backers say that it tells us only that reputed "political wizards" Dolan and Viguerie are idiots. ■

Shop Around

By Dan Handelman

(The set is inside a supermarket. Two sets of shelves mark the edges of three aisles, and at the far sides of the stage, two more sets of shelves against walls seal off the set. Above the aisles, in this order, signs read:

1. NSM, Natural Science and Math
2. SBS, Social & Behavioral Science
3. H.A. Humanities & Arts

The shelves are stacked with papers and books. In the background is a sign reading "WESBAUM'S" as though it were on the inside of a window. DOUG and RALPH, two WES students, are in the far aisles with shopping carts. They each check papers and books as though they are items in a supermarket.)

(A LOUDSPEAKER VOICE which occasionally comes on, interrupts piped in MUZAK versions of the national anthem and Wesleyan fight songs.)

VOICE: Shoppers are reminded that Wesbaum's closes Friday at 4:30. Special shopping hours will be available at extra charge.

RALPH: (shaking his head) What a hummer. There are so many courses I'd really like to take.

DOUG: Ralph? (He waves hello, then indicates colored cards and course syllabi he has in his hands) I really love this shop around. I picked up all these syllabi and course cards for courses I'm never going to take.

RALPH: Hi, Doug! Oh, good thing you're over by the Natural Sciences. Do you have a course card for Math 199? I have to buy all my course cards by 4:30.

DOUG: I haven't got one yet. The teacher said he wants to wait until Monday to be sure of who's in the class.

RALPH: But can't you have to pay extra?

DOUG: Nah, I don't even want to register now. I just signed up so I can get in NEXT semester.

RALPH: But I need a math credit and I really wanted to take that course! Math for poets. Here, I'll forget this Advanced Analysis of Depl 20th Century Authors for now and take that instead.

VOICE: Please be reminded that purchases of more than five items or fewer than three must be arranged with the manager. Thank you.

(RALPH takes the papers from his aisle and moves all the way down to the other aisle after a labious process of avoiding stacks of books, etc.)

RALPH: Hey, this course is at the same time as my SBS credit course—Psych 100: "Why Does the Groundhog Look for his Shadow?"—How am I going to make up my mind?

DOUG: Well, that's the beauty of shop-around. You can find out whether you like a course, and if you're lucky, you get in one you like.

(RALPH looks at the SBS syllabus and the NSM one DOUG has been holding)

RALPH: I haven't had enough time to look at any courses except the ones I WANT to take, the Humanities ones. Is this math class going to be any good?

VOICE: We would like to remind shoppers that they must purchase four items from any two aisles and two from another before their fifth visit to Wesbaum's. Thank you.

DOUG: Listen, just come to the class. I hear it's really good.

RALPH: O.k. I guess I don't really need this SBS credit anyway. This Math 199 is going to help me fill my distribution requirements.

(He puts the SBS syllabus in the cart and, while reading the NSM one, turns the cart around. He knocks into the self-standing shelf and it falls over, spilling papers, and hitting the other shelf, which also falls over.)

VOICE: Shoppers are reminded that credit is not given unless confirmed by the Check-Out counter or suitable means of payment are presented. Thank you.

RALPH: Well, now that shop-around is over, it's time to start my work-studies program.

(He bends over and begins to clean up as "My Mama Told Me...You Better Shop Around" begins playing over the loudspeaker and the lights dim)

CURTAIN



Russell Ford Speaks

continued from page 1

August 11, 1982

Dear Family, Friends and Supporters,

Did you know that here they bring us breakfast in bed? I suppose that's to make up for the size of the cell, which is about 5' by 8', holding two of us.

Anyway, I thank you all for caring. It meant a lot to me that so many of you were able to come to court with me. My friend [Ed Hasbrouck] and I were brought over to Danbury last night, handcuffed and chained around the waist. When we were searched and given our new clothes the admissions guard laughed, and said they always get you in uniform one way or the other. (He knew what we were in for, and the clothes are army surplus khaki).

Ed and I are on the first floor of the administrative detention unit, which John Bach can probably describe to you. [John Bach is an old Wesleyan student who did 25 months in Federal Prison during the Vietnam War for refusing induction; he also just did 30 days in Danbury for chaining himself to the Hartford Federal Building doors in protest of U.S. involvement in El Salvador]. They want to keep Ed and I apart physically (I wonder why?) so we're told I'm allowed out of my cell into the hall recreation area five hours in the morning, and I guess he'll get out in the afternoon. So he and I can talk through the bars of his cell.

Administrative detention (ADDT) is where pre-trial prisoners are kept. I've a copy of the memo to the "Special Housing Unit Officer" ordering me kept here because my "...presence in the general population..." would "...pose a serious threat to life, property, self, staff, other inmates or the security of the institution because" "inmate arrived this date from U.S.D.M (U.S. Deputy Marshalls) and is a pre-trial inmate."

That may sound grim but things are actually pretty cool here, just a lot of folks who couldn't make bail, waiting trial.

(Continued Wednesday evening). Not long after I phoned Eco, house this morning Ed and I were transferred to the hospital unit. This is allegedly for our protection from other prisoners. A few of the men there knew who I was, and more or less what I was in there for, but neither of us had had any indication of trouble. This cell is rather larger and I'm the only one in it. Being here is definitely not an improvement, (as the guards would have us think it is) as it effectively limits my human contact to: 1) saying hello to guards bringing meals, and officers coming in to explain the rules; 2) seeing other prisoners exercising in the courtyard (I have a window); and 3) Ed and I can communicate when the hall is quiet by yelling through the cracks under our doors.

A Letter From Prison



WIN—Sept. 18, 1982

(Continued Wed. evening). The two of us were given our physical examinations, blood and urine tests, chest x-rays, T.B. tests and tetanus shots, and I was transferred into a double occupancy room (which I'm in alone), that is pretty much a slightly grungier version of the room at the Warm Springs hospital, where I was treated last year for a snake bite, except for the locked door and barred windows. The medical officer said there is a chance Ed will be put in here with me tomorrow.

I was arraigned Tuesday in the Hartford U.S. District Court. I had invited many of my friends from Connecticut, and from various of the groups I've worked with, to come to the hearing. Also had told the press—far more of whom came than I expected—so that I spent most of the 45 minutes before the arraignment answering media questions rather than welcoming my friends. Humph. My advise to future inditees is to arrange a set time and place for the press, if you're into media politics, but to make sure you have time for the important stuff. Did anyone get a count on who came? It looked to me like maybe 35 sitting and 20 standing?

The charges against me were read, and my rights explained in considerable detail. When I was told to plea Magistrate Egan explained he could only accept a plea of Not Guilty. I asked Ed to read the complicity statement we had written, which many of my "Friends, Family, and Neighbors" had signed. Ed was suppressed, as he was "making a speech", in an inappropriate place, or something. So I made a statement to the effect that neither "Guilty" nor "Not Guilty" described my

position, that lawyers familiar with draft law had told me the registration and indictment process have serious legal flaws, but that what I hoped to make was an explanation of moral reasons for resistance. I then read to the magistrate the complicity statement, and "entered it in the record of the court." He then entered a plea "for me" of not guilty, read a bunch of dates for motions, and told me I'd be given a copy "within a day." I have not yet been given in writing such information.

My impression also is that several of the inditees and prospective inditees have been under considerable subtle pressure to let the lawyers use them to try out all of the neat new challenges and loopholes and constitutional misgivings they've been tracking down and preparing ever since the mess began in 1980. I don't mean any offense to folks who've been through law school. The law can be a powerful tool, and is respected deeply as a concept by many or most Americans. It is good that there are a few people doing public defender-public service-advocacy work, such as the feminist law collective in New Haven seems to do. But I don't think our civil disobedience trials are really the place for it.



Maybe the most interesting part of all this came when we tried to figure out if I would be locked up until the trial or if they would let me go. Mr. Egan said that he was requiring bond of \$10,000, which turns out to mean that you don't give them any money up front, but that they can sue you for the money if you don't show for trial. They gave me a copy to sign, which was ridiculously long, with it hard to tell which sections would apply to me. But I didn't like the money part, so I had to refuse.

Ben, Enton, David, and Mark had, as I understood it, all signed. Kathy Gilbert (N.L.G., Los Angeles) had told me Ben at least had been reluctant, but had signed, the argument being that we're more effective outside. Yes, it's easier to do interviews, for whatever they're worth—and yes, it's harder to get a copy of, say, Emma Goldman's draft trial speech, when we're in jail. But

...and a note on other prosecutions

The following is excerpted from a mailing of the National Lawyers Guild Military Task Force to its members and chapter contacts, dated September 1, 1982. The mailing focused primarily on the prosecution and trials of Ben Sasway and Enten Eller, the first two men indicted this summer for refusing to register for the draft.

The first cases give us some indication of what future prosecutions may look like, and of the Justice Department's prosecution policy. So far, the indictments in these cases have been almost identical, apparently based on a "sample" indictment prepared at Justice. In [Enten] Eller and [Ben] Sasway's cases, the government flew in SSS [Selective Service System] officials to testify about their detection methods and computer system. According to their computer expert, David Cox, the SSS computer system is 100 percent efficient, since all errors are detected and corrected in the course of processing. The government argues that there is a continuing duty to register, and the first five indictments are worded accordingly.

The documents and testimony introduced by the government in Sasway's evidentiary hearing tell us a good deal about current policy on prosecutions, though the government argued that disclosure of the policy may require its change. Justice Department memos used in the hearing explain that only "the most adamant" resisters will be prosecuted, and that "if a non-registrant registers prior to indictment, the investigation will be terminated." When a non-registrant complies after indictment but before trial, the US Attorney will seek imposition of an appropriate sanction ranging from pretrial diversion to probation." Likewise, Ed Frankle testified that it is SSS policy to assume that those who counsel non-registration and those with severe physical disabilities should not be considered for prosecution now. Portions of these memos were excised by the judge, so that we cannot evaluate other portions of the policy which may be more "sensitive."

The documents also indicate that Justice is quite concerned about the "thorny selective prosecution claims" which may be raised by the use of the passive detection



Army Medical Examiner: "At last a perfect soldier!"

program. Justice officials discussed the possibility of postponing prosecutions until an active detection program was enacted, for this reason, but discarded the idea.

The memos also show an extremely high degree of Justice Department controls over the prosecutions. In addition to departmental preparation of indictments (which they deny), local US Attorneys are told to notify the Criminal Division when warning letters are sent out, and the memos say that "no cases or matter will be declined or dismissed without prior authorization from the Criminal Division." Justice has also prepared an "essential elements" memo discussing prosecutions and likely defenses, which was distributed to US Attorneys, and which we have not been able to obtain.

—Kathy Gilbert

CATCH-22, 1982 STYLE

As much as we admire the principled stand Benjamin H. Sasway (and Enten Eller before him) took against draft registration, we were also struck by a legalistic argument the defense raised during Sasway's trial last week in San Diego. Sasway's lawyer claimed that a letter his client had written to President Carter protesting registration technically fulfilled the law's requirements. After all, the government had his name and address.

The argument serves to highlight the bizarre logic of registration, which seems to have been borrowed from Joseph Heller's great war novel, *Catch-22*. We can imagine an elderly Doc Daneeka explaining the system to Yossarian's grandson.

"You see," Doc says, "registration tells the government where you are in case they want to draft you."

"So if I object to being drafted on moral or religious grounds I can be a conscientious objector?" Yossarian 3rd asks.

"No, it's a registration, not a draft."

"But if I don't register, they can put me in jail."

"Right — if they know where you are."

"How do they find that out?"

"Well, they could get your address from Social Security or drivers' license lists, but if they did that, they would be admitting registration is a fraud. Or they could cross-index registrations with Internal Revenue Service lists, but that might be unconstitutional. So they wait for you to protest on moral or religious grounds. Then they prosecute you."

"So only those people who protest are prosecuted?"

"Right. If you're moral enough to protest, you're immoral enough to go to jail. Catch-22."

"That's some catch, that Catch-22."

"Well, it's all they could think of."

(reprinted from *The Nation*, September 4, 1982)



this effectiveness line is what I (at least) was told when I went public, also. The point is that we are supposed to be acting out of a moral imperative, conscience—as Brethren, Catholics, anarchists, or whatever. If we have objections to war, registration, we may refuse to fill out the S.S. card. If we have qualms about signing a statement in court—and especially if we do not accept the judicial-criminal-legal system generally—then we ought to refuse that too. Certainly there are enough supporters, non-registrants, and prospective inditees out there to explain what we're up to. And this being an enlightened sort of place we get to write letters, and even try for a phone call or two. If we can get the press to pay attention for once to folks other than us actually in jail, or facing it, we'll even avoid a bit of their attempts to make us into isolated hero-martyr-fools—rather than one tendency among the many sorts of believers and resisters. Have you ever tried to get a T.V. reporter to interview a woman about registration-resistance-prosecutions? If she is not your mother, forget it.

Some people have money and power. They aren't the ones who fight in the trenches, or who get their hands dirty working, and they aren't the ones who fill the jails. (Also, not the ones who pick up hitch-hikers!) The military-economic-legal-social system serves and protects them—it cushions them from the struggle, pain of life, which makes complacency easy. What I'm trying to get to is that when we made open our non-registration, we did so (I hope) willing and able to go to jail, for breaking that rule, as act of moral witness. In jail or outside there are rules—for "going too far" we can be punished. The difference between jail and outside isn't between freedom and loss of freedom—jail's just where the acceptable limits are stricter, or at least more obvious (much more!) I don't think we can separate the military from the economic and legal structure, opposing one, but accepting the others. They're all integral parts of "The System" (a term that is my favorite bit of paranoid leftist imprecision). The way Eugene Debbs put it was "while there is a lower class, I am in it. While there is a criminal element, I am

of it. While there is a soul in prison I am not free." That's from his draft trial circa 1918—he was convicted under the Espionage Act for advocating draft resistance in wartime.

So back to the story. Once it was clear I wasn't signing, the U.S. Deputy Marshalls took me by the arm to lead me out. Ed, adamant about this "prosecute all, or none" line we'd given the judge—embraces me and moves to walk out with me and the marshalls. They try to separate us, fast, and drag us out into the hall together. They inform us we're under arrest (it turns out only Ed is charged) with assaulting federal agents. (Things are still confused, maybe it's only obstructing an agent). So once we hear that we get up, together, and are led to the holding cells (proper little boxcars with everything bolted down, a video monitor watching you from a ceiling corner, and no window (even in the door)). Almost clean but a bad place to live.

The prosecutor, Dick Palmer, and a public defender, James Bergen, came in to the cell, wanting to work something out, I think embarrassed that I had been jailed.

They figured the judge might reconsider, and one of them I think went to have a talk with Mr. Egan. So an hour or so later I was called back into the courtroom. I read a statement I'd just written as my promise to appear in court, and said I'd sign line 1) "Personal Recognizance: I promise to appear in court at all times required"—but that I would not sign 2) "I hereby bind myself to the United States for the sum of \$10,000." The judge refused, citing my alleged lack of ties to Connecticut, ignoring my obvious deep ties to the community as evidenced by my interest in and commitment to local 'political' and 'religious' groups, and that I care enough to have gone to jail several times to try to save it (and me) from getting nuked.

So they took me out again, and with Ed was transferred to Danbury Federal Correctional Institution that night. We're being held right now in isolation in the hospital unit, which means we each have a decent room to ourselves. Consider being locked in a cheap hotel room, brought meals which you eat there, and that's about what it is. We, me especially, seem to be star prisoners who they aren't taking any chances with. I've been told two reasons we're not in with the other pre-trial prisoners, the first being that we might get in trouble, that they have to protect us—the second being that we might cause trouble, like inspiring a food strike, or so they need to protect the other prisoners from us. I don't think either of those is very likely.

I've been getting out some to do interviews, which breaks things up and gives me someone to talk with. We haven't figured out what mail, phone, and visitor regulations will be. I'll try to keep you posted there at Ecology House.

There are geese on the grounds. I can hear honking sometimes. I love you,

Russ

"Laws...we know what they are worth. They are spiderwebs for the rich and mighty, steel chains for the poor and weak, fishing nets in the hands of the government."

-P-J Proudhon



Thoughts on My Release

I initially declined to sign the bond because I think my words or written promise to return ought to be enough. I hoped Magistrate Eagan would be able to understand my reluctance to offer a guarantee of my integrity and behavior or beliefs in terms of money. We appealed the bond, but despite written statements as to my character from a number of quite-respectable-citizen-types, he refused to accept my word.

A month in prison is long enough for now. I wanted to get through to the magistrate as another human being, but did not succeed. His comments in court reveal a narrower mind, and less common sense, than he would probably like to admit.

So I want to get out, to touch the earth, see my friends, get on with preparing my draft case. Maybe this seems unclear or inconsistent, that I am backing down. If it is, I'm sorry. There is great usefulness to public no-saying, to non-cooperation. But I am afraid that in doing this sometimes we put the 'value' of the act above the end we want it to bring. I don't want to be a proper male trying to force another male into some action. I can't force him, and at least on this issue I don't want to. I hoped he would change his attitude but it seems he has not. It seems I don't have the power (or whatever) to convince him on this point, so maybe I should do what I can. Get out, laugh and love in open air, see the leaves turn while I have the chance.

Russell Ford
Sept. 10, 1982
Hartford Detention
Area



Trident Demo Draws 300

By Philip Rive

Nearly 300 people gathered Saturday at The Electric Boat Shipyard, in Groton, Connecticut, to protest the commissioning of the second Trident submarine, the USS Michigan. Representatives from local peace groups, Nuclear Freeze organizations, Mobilization for Survival and the War Registers League walked a short distance from the Trident monument to the gates of the shipyard. They stood for several hours singing, chanting, and displaying signs to the arriving military personnel and guests invited to participate in the commissioning. As one of the last groups of officials entered the shipyard, a group of nine protestors stepped into their paths. They spread ashes on the ground and collapses screaming, symbolically enacting the result of a nuclear attack. They were arrested and carried away as fellow demonstrators sang and gave support from the sidelines. Later, two others, Vicent Kaye and Tim Quinn, both presently on trial for trespassing on and damaging the first Trident, were also taken into custody for carrying a banner made out of an American flag. Both have been released until their arraignment on October 1st. Five of the nine others remain in custody after refusing to give their names to the police.

The purpose of the demonstration was to publicize the importance of the Trident in the escalation of the arms race.

Trident submarines constitute a highly accurate, nearly indestructible force which will put the Soviets on the defensive, forcing them to put their missiles on "launch-on-warning" alert. This means that they could attack us on the suspicion of a planned U.S. attack, or because of a false alarm. The building of the Trident increases the possibility of nuclear war. In addition, the USS Michigan alone cost \$1.2 billion to build. The Trident program will be paid for with money taken from already underfunded social programs. The demands of the protest, stated by the organizers, were for a bi-lateral nuclear freeze, economic conversion of defense industries to peaceful uses, and the development of non-violent methods of defense, under the auspices of a National Peace Academy.

SUPPORT THE TRIDENT NEIN!

The Trident Nein are still on trial for their new, improved attempt to turn a submarine into a plowshare. Get in touch and give them your presence and support at their trial.

Call:

(203)-562-7935
(203)-624-4569

Jews and Israel

continued from page 3

associated with Israel—I'm not going to be a Jew if that's what being a Jew means" Anger at Israel expressed in this manner, by rejecting a Jewish identity, can also reinforce the feeling of self-hate that stems from an often unconscious recognition that being a Jew is not desirable in America. I see this as the feeling of wanting to hide being Jewish or being glad one doesn't "look Jewish" or have a Jewish-sounding name.

The anger goes deep because we feel betrayed by Israel and by Jewish American leaders who told us how wonderful Israel was. I grew up feeling that the Jews, having been oppressed for so long, would continue to side with the oppressed of the world. I read Leon Uris' Exodus and felt proud of Jews living in the land of the Bible. Israel represented my Jewish identity. Now, when the Israeli government shoots Palestinian teenagers, closes down Palestinian universities, forces the Druses in the Golan Heights to carry Israeli ID cards, and supports South Africa, I feel betrayed.

The last major internal difficulty an American Jew faces in criticizing Israeli policy comes from guilt. Now that Israel exists, the diaspora or galut (meaning exile) is a matter of choice. American Jews have chosen to live here rather than go to Israel, where they would automatically become citizens. However, most American Jews feel that it's nice to know that Israel is there— if anti-semitism gets too bad here, we can always go there. Israel becomes the place which one can feel proud of and at the same time need not to act too Jewish at home or confront perplexing problems of Jewish identity. Israel becomes a substitute for being Jewish. However, this leads to a feeling of guilt: Israelis are risking their lives for us, so what right do we have to criticize them?

The element of guilt also arises for those who feel that

continued on page 9



Lemmings and Us

By Peter Shabecoff

THE LEMMING CONDITION by Alan Arkin. Illustrated by Jean Sandin. Harper & Row. 58 pp.

Many years after I had ceased to fit the standard definition of a child, a friend gave me a "children's" book which affected me profoundly. *The Lemming Condition*, by Alan Arkin, published by Harper & Row, is an entertaining, yet perceptive, parable of the self-destructive tendencies of modern society. Lemmings are an Alaskan rodent noted for their bizarre reaction to population pressures. When a community of lemmings gets too crowded, the entire population heads straight west, jumps into the ocean, and drowns.

The book is written in a simple but uncondescending style that any child of eight would enjoy. It tells the story of one lemming, named Bubber, who dares to question those around him when his colony starts its suicidal march to the sea. And through this unmistakably anthropomorphic metaphor, the book celebrates the conscience of any individual who confronts the sickness within her/his society, and within her/himself. In his quest for a reason, Bubber encounters many of the traditional justifications for mass insanity: "It's the natural order of

things." "It's the way it's always been." "Don't ask questions, you're too young to understand." Bubber's Uncle Claude embodies traditional lemming values. The description of Uncle Claude's reaction to Bubber's doubts is illuminating. "He (Claude) remembered back to his own time of questioning. Like the rest of his kind, he had outgrown it, and had settled finally into a wistful acceptance of himself and the condition of his people. It hadn't exactly filled him with any peace or joy, but there were other things." But Bubber doesn't settle for these "other things." He chooses conscience over conformity, and heads off in his own direction.

This is a book that any child, or anybody with a mind as open as that of a child, will be glad to read. More importantly, it will help a child to foster a healthy skepticism of social norms at the time that his intellectual perspective is forming. Give it as a birthday present to your favorite pre-adolescent radical. ■

Peter Shabecoff/ '85 is a first-time contributor to *Hermes*.



graphic by Debbie Eagles

Nuclear Resistance Group

The Wesleyan Nuclear Resistance Group held its first meeting of the year on Wednesday, Sept. 8. This meeting was attended by more than 50 Wesleyan students. During the meeting, NRG's continuing members discussed the history and evolution of the group as well as plans for this year. In the past, the NRG has been an environmental action group but over the last two years the focus has completely shifted to nuclear disarmament. The group has undertaken an educational campaign which includes speakers, movies and an extensive library of disarmament literature. This educational effort has extended beyond Wesleyan. A slide show dealing with the issues of a nuclear age has been shown at several area high schools in an attempt to initiate dialogue among the students.

Another objective of the NRG this year will be to coordinate events with other disarmament and nuclear weapons freeze groups. An informational network of Connecticut campuses is being prepared to distribute information about upcoming events. In addition to college and university groups, the NRG hopes to maintain a close working relationship with STAND (Study and Action group for Nuclear Disarmament), the Middletown disarmament group. STAND met on Sunday, Sept. 12 and discussed their objectives for this year, and expressed a strong interest in coordinating events with the NRG.

About 30 Wesleyan students participated in the first NRG action of the year on Saturday, Sept. 11. The group traveled to Groton, Conn. to protest the commissioning of the latest US Trident submarine, the USS Michigan. A crowd of about 250 demonstrators gathered outside of the General Dynamics plant where the submarine was commissioned. The organizational meeting and the Groton action left everyone excited about the future of the NRG. This has been by far the best start for the NRG in many years. NRG meetings are held on Wednesdays at 8:00 PM in Woodhead Lounge. New members are always welcome. For more information call Mike Steinberg at 344-8443 or Danny McCormick at 346-0237. For information about STAND call Julian Simon at 346-0237. ■



by Mary Freeman

This fall, more women than ever before turned out to practice for the Coed Wesleyan Frisbee Club. Most of the women came for one day and didn't come back. Kris Torgeson, a freshman, thought that the reason had to do with the many problems of trying to play a sport on a "co-ed" team that is 95% male. She decided to call a practice for Wesleyan's Women's Ultimate Frisbee Club on Saturday, September 11. Twelve women came to the first practice, and ten others called to express interest. Each had a different reason for wanting to play. Some had played in high school; some were tired of being spectators at the men's games; some had thrown a frisbee for years but never played Ultimate and wanted to try.



The club has decided to get together three or four times a week to learn the game, develop skills, get some exercise, and have fun. The atmosphere will focus on non-competitive, supportive women's Ultimate, attempting to recover some of the "mellowness" of the sport.

If the spirit of the first two practices is any indication, Wesleyan Women's Ultimate is off and running. The club is part of a movement on the east coast to organize women's Ultimate teams. Teams have sprung up in Boston, Washington, D.C., and a handful of colleges and universities. Women are creating a place for themselves in response to the competitive pressure

Ultimate!

By David Webber

they have felt playing with men.

Come join us! No experience necessary. We meet at these times at the Long Lane Fields near the hockey rink:

Tuesday at 5:00
Wednesday at 5:00
Friday at 4:00

Saturday at 4:00
Practice times are open to adjustment.
If you have conflicts, call Kris at 346-9783 or Mary at 344-1292. ■



graphic by David Hamburger

The Nietzsche Factor, Wesleyan's Ultimate Frisbee team, anticipates a rigorous autumn. The fall schedule includes the tremendous three-day-long Ultimate Affair at UMass/Amherst. This year, they expect to break last year's record for the biggest tournament ever; over 75 teams are expected. The other major events of the fall are the Connecticut State Ultimate Championships to be held here at Wesleyan on Saturday, October 16, and at Yale the 17th. Thereafter, the sectional, regional, national tournament progression will determine a national champion. The spring includes a progressive sectional, regional, and eastern Championship. In addition there will be several newer tournaments in the south, such as the "April Fools" tournament, held in

the spring the team stumbled and fell at the significantly more competitive sectionals after a successful visit to the University of Georgia's Ultimate Bowl I in Athens, Ga. The team's Disc Day (last April 4) helped raise money to send two crowded vehicles on the 24-hour drive to Athens just two weeks after the infamous April blizzard. The trip was highlighted by a spirited, rain-soaked, overtime victory over Lunar Space Disc of Melbourne, Florida.

This year's team looks to have even more potential than last year's. Talented freshmen helped make the team strong last year and this year's class will add more depth to the team, which lost only two players to graduation. The weekend of September 10th brought 24 members of the Nietzsche Factor to UConn/Storrs where they joined 12 or 13 other teams in daylong competitions. The team played badly in a first game loss but improved and finished with a decisive victory over Trinity. This is the first time the team won a game on the first day of the season in 3 or 4 years. The team expects to continue its improvement and anticipates its best year ever. ■

The Game

Ultimate Frisbee, or more correctly "Ultimate" (since "Frisbee" is just a brand name). Whatever you call it, it still comes back to The Game, and the game called Ultimate is an exciting and spectacular sport.

Invented at a high school in New Jersey in 1968, Ultimate has grown to be a popular, traditionally coed sports alternative.

The rules are simple. Two teams of seven players each attempt to pass the disc from player to player down the field to the endzone. Players cannot run with the frisbee disc (they may pivot, as in basketball) and if it is knocked out of the air or dropped, the other team takes possession and moves the other way. The sport is played on a field approximately 70 yds. by 40 yds. with 30 yd. end zones. Teams can play to points (usually 15 or 21) or by time (often 30 minute halves).

Only 14 years from its birth, Ultimate has no referees or strictly organized leagues or divisions. Players make their own calls, team captains make the schedules and various annual tournaments are organized. ■

Virginia, and the Ultimate Bowl, held at the University of Georgia at Athens.

Club teams composed of veteran players usually dominate Ultimate competition, largely because of the informality of the game. College teams can compete but usually schedule games against teams of comparative ability. Wesleyan's Nietzsche Factor often competes very well even against Club teams.

Last fall, led by captain Todd Maybrow the team recovered from an abysmal start to reach the regional tournament at UMass, and went on to win one of three games while there. In

Fall Schedule

Sept. 25-26	tentative home match
Oct. 1(2-3)-4	Ultimate Affair UMass
Oct. 9-10	tentative discathon date
Oct. 16-17	Conn. State Ultimate Championships Here/Yale
Oct. 23-24	Sectionals SUNY Purchase
Oct. 30-31	Intersectional ?
Nov. 6-7	Regionals UMass?

Jews and Israel

continued from page 7

Europe, on the ground that if Americans felt the war was being fought to save Jews, they might not fight it. The prominent Jews complied.

Those are three of the problems we face inside ourselves. But American Jews who want to publicly oppose Israeli policy face another problem: the opposition of the American Jewish establishment, which generally denounces any criticism of Israeli policy as disloyal, supportive of Palestinian violence, and self-hating. For example, in 1946 I.F. Stone wrote a book now called *Underground to Palestine*; and *Reflections Thirty Years Later*. The book was sympathetic to the struggle of Holocaust survivors to get into Palestine. Because he refused to leave out one sentence in which he called for a binational state recognizing both Arab and Jewish claims to the land, he was in effect excommunicated, banned from any mainstream public Jewish forum.

III

A more recent example of American Jewish establishment opposition to Jews criticizing Israeli policy was the attack on Breira, an organization of American Jews formed in 1973. Breira is the Hebrew word for "alternative." It was chosen as a name to challenge the Israeli government's defense of its policies. The Israeli government was saying, "ain breira," there's no alternative. American Jews were saying, "there are alternatives and we want to hear about them and discuss them." Breira as a name also meant that the group saw itself as an alternative to the mainstream Jewish organizations in the United States.

One of Breira's charter members, William Novack, described Breira's founders in this way:

"In general, the people who founded Breira, who were active Jews committed to a strong Israel, believed that Israel could— and should— be more flexible in its negotiating posture vis-a-vis the Arabs; they also believed that Israel could do more than it was doing to encourage peace talks."

Bob Loeb, the executive director of Breira, said: "The purpose of Breira is to open up a serious discussion of political, ideological, and religious issues in the Jewish community. This discussion has been forestalled primarily because of a growing equation between Jewish identity and particular policies of the Israeli government."

Breira supported mutual Palestinian and Israeli recognition, and in 1975 began to advocate the formation of a Palestinian state on the West Bank. A year later they started a publication they described as "a monthly review of issues facing Israel and the Diaspora" called *Interchange*. They sponsored speaking tours by two Israelis who shared their views: Arie Eliaz and General Matti Peled. Although Breira also supported a range of other positions, especially advocating a more democratic decision-making procedure within American Jewish organizations, Israel was the number one issue.

Breira members said over and over that they were committed to the survival of Israel. As Sid Resnick, a New Haven Breira member, said, "We mustn't let Jews think we're indifferent to the fate of Israel. We love Israel and are for Israel, and the criticism we are making is because we are for Israel. They recognized the fear that criticism of Israel's policies would evoke in Jews, and tried to calm the fear by arguing that different policies toward the Palestinians might make Israel, and by extension Jews everywhere, more secure."

The people who organized Breira included rabbis from both reform and conservative movements, some of whom had been active in the anti-Vietnam war movement. About one quarter of the rabbis who headed Bnai Brith Hillel houses on college campuses were in Breira. It included Zionists and non-Zionists, religious and non-religious Jews. Rabbi Wolf from Yale was the chairperson.

IV

In New Haven, the Jewish Federation, representing all the major Jewish organizations, allowed a Breira representative on to its board. In most places, however, Breira was attacked by both establishment and right-wing Jewish organizations. The attack reached its height early in 1977, after two Breira members, Rabbi Max Ticktin and Arthur Waskow, met in Washington with three other American Jews and two PLO members, Sabri Jiryis and Issam Sartawi. After this meeting, the president of the Zionist Organization of America tried to get Rabbi Ticktin fired from his job as assistant national director of the Bnai Brith Hillel foundation, by conducting a letter writing campaign to Bnai Brith declaring that Rabbi Ticktin was letting university Hillel rabbis become spokesmen for Palestinians. "The National Jewish Community Relations Advisory Council", said Carolyn Toll in *The Progressive* (8/79), "urged Jews to shun anyone openly supporting Israeli negotiations with the PLO." Breira was attacked as an ally of the PLO and as a group which worked to have American Jews abandon Israel, in both the *Jewish Week*, a newspaper with wide distribution published in New York, and in the US Congress. Israeli consulate staffers called some Breira members to urge them not to go to Breira's February 1977 conference, telling them speaking against the position of the Israeli government was roughly equivalent to speaking against the Jewish state itself." Breira was attacked in Friday night sermons as disloyal to Israel. The speaking tour arranged

by Breira for Israeli General Matti Peled was boycotted by national Jewish organizations who sent memos to their local groups saying he was "a mouthpiece for the PLO." His speaking engagements were suddenly canceled. And at the Breira conference in 1977, the Jewish Defense League demonstrated, carrying signs like "Death to Breira."

Several prominent Jewish leaders did not join in the attack against Breira. Alex Schindler, chairman of the Conference of Presidents of Major Jewish organizations, called the attack on Breira a witch hunt and said that some of his members were "fully in sympathy with many of Breira's views." And the American Jewish Committee's Bert Gold resisted pressure to fire members who publicly identified with Breira.

The most widespread attack seems to have been the vast distribution in January 1977 of a thirty page pamphlet called "Breira: Counsel for Judaism." The author was Rael Jean Isaac, a supporter of the right wing Gush Erunim in Israel. It was printed by Americans for a Safe Israel, a small group also supporting an alternative to Israeli policy, but to the right. They support more Jewish settlements and Israeli seizure of more land from the Arabs. (It is interesting that right-wing dissent has been more tolerated than left-wing dissent in the United States.) The co-chairman of Americans for a Safe Israel, Herb Zweibon, was asked by a British journalist for his reactions to accusations of witch-hunting. He answered, "If there are witches, why not hunt?"

The pamphlet they published argues that Breira is working against the interests and the existence of Israel. It evokes fear by painting some of the main people in Breira as anti-American, pro-communist, and anti-Israel. It compares Breira to Fatah, the main organization in the PLO, saying, "If Jews want to organize on behalf of Fatah, that is their privilege. But let them call it 'Jews for Fatah' and not 'Breira.'"

The issue in all this had become the right to dissent from the left of Israeli policy, and Breira— and dissent— lost. Under the barrage of attacks, internal personal disputes magnified in importance. Finally, in 1978, Breira stopped functioning.

Yet Breira had broken the ice. It enabled Jews who wanted to propose alternatives to Israeli policy to know what we are up against, to help prepare us for the shock of being attacked by other Jews. Its existence paved the way for future organizations.

In 1980 the New Jewish Agenda was formed, which continues today. It too is trying to open up discussion of other alternatives to Israeli policy. At the same time it is also much broader than Breira was, addressing issues of gay rights and El Salvador as well as the Middle East. In part this is a conscious effort to avoid going out on one limb and becoming labeled anti-Israel, as Breira was. Donny Perlestein, coordinator of the New Jewish Agenda Middle East task force, writes:

"The desire to build a truly multi-issue organization and avoid the pitfalls that beset other recent progressive American Jewish efforts (most notably BREIRA) led New Jewish Agenda's founders to make a conscious decision to discourage having the Middle East question dominate the attention of the organization."

The difference in emphasis is reflected in the name. Rather than a Hebrew name expressing a oneness with Israel while directly countering itself to Israeli policy, the name New Jewish Agenda is in English, and is both broader and vaguer, not defining itself in direct opposition to the Israeli leadership.

Another reason that New Jewish Agenda has received less flack than Breira did besides its greater range of issues and vagueness on the Middle East is that Begin is now in power in Israel, and he is alienating Jewish leaders here. Begin's policies are taking Israel beyond what the American establishment would like to see, so that to support Begin means American Jewish leaders have to oppose the American establishment.

In contrast to the difficulty of expressing dissent in

the United States, in Israel there has been continuing criticism of government policy on many issues. The Israeli people are full of contrasts and conflicts. There is a broad spectrum of political parties. There are Jews and Israeli Arabs. There are European Jews, and the often poorer and discriminated-against Asian, African and Arab Jews. There are orthodox, conservative, reform and non-believing Jews. In April fifty Peace Now demonstrators got in a scuffle with other Jews on the West Bank, where the Peace Now people were trying to prevent the establishment of another Jewish settlement. In March, several thousand Israelis rallied in Tel Aviv to protest the government's harsh measures against Palestinians on the West Bank.

The Israeli left feels that it would be more effective in shaping if it received more support from those American Jews who agree with it. Leon Sheleff, an Israeli, says: "...one of the reasons for the inability of dissenters in Israel to make any impact on the government was precisely because it [the government] was being given all the support—moral, political, financial, and perhaps, most important, psychological—that it needed from the world Jewish community." Talking about American dissenters, he continues: "...what is crucial is not whether dissenters have to be extra careful about offending the Israeli establishment, but whether they have to be especially considerate of providing the same moral and psychological support for dissent in Israel that the American Jewish establishment provides for the Israel establishment."

If we remember that the Jewish-Arab conflict is relatively recent, we can see hopes for an end to that conflict in the future, by supporting those Israelis and Americans that are working for both Palestinian and Jewish survival.

Rael Jean Isaac, Herbert Zweibon, and Erich Isaac wrote in the "Jewish Week—American Examiner" more recently, defending Begin's award of a medal to Jerry Falwell: "Even apart from the vital issue of Israel, at this time there is a far greater communality of interests among Jews and the Moral Majority than there is among Jews and the National Council of Churches."

"Donny Perlestein, 'New Jewish Agenda and The Middle East Question,' Morning Freiheit, 11/26/81.

In the same article Donny Perlestein poses some fascinating questions to the Editorial Council of New Outlook, a group in the Middle East:

1) As specifically as possible, what are the two or three key activities that we in the U.S. could initiate in your behalf to assist you in winning over Israeli Jews to the positions of the peace camp? Similarly, what can we do to assist you in making an appeal to the rest of American Jewry?

2) Assuming we don't mean to support the perpetuation of any discrimination directed against Israel's non-Jewish citizens, what do you mean when we speak of supporting Israel as a Jewish state (as opposed to simply supporting the State of Israel)?

3) Is it a contradiction for progressive American Jews to urge our government to get involved in Middle East peace efforts at the same time that we hold a vision of the Middle East free from imperialism and foreign influence?

4) Given the attempts by the present U.S. government to revive a cold war climate and to pose the USSR as the major threat to Middle East stability, how do you view the role of the USSR in Middle East peace efforts?

5) How vulnerable is Israel militarily, especially considering the spiraling arms race and the introduction of nuclear technology in the region? What does the future hold for the Israeli economy considering its growing dependence on U.S. government foreign aid?

6) What is the actual situation in regard to the Israel peace camp's relations with the third world and the democratic and progressive forces in the Middle East?

7) Looking toward the future, what is your vision of Israeli-Diaspora relations? What can we do now to further the building of closer ties and friendships between the emerging American Jewish progressive leadership and the progressive people's leaders within Israel?"

One indication of the much lesser amount of controversy New Jewish Agenda has inspired compared to Breira is a comparison of the number of listings for each organization during the period of its existence in the *Index to Jewish Periodicals*. Under "Breira" there are eight listings for the July-December 1978 period, seventeen for the January-June 1977 period, and eight for the July-December 1977 period. "New Jewish Agenda" is listed only once for the July-December 1980 period, once for the January-June 1981 period, and not since then.

The Massacre in Beirut

Reject the accusations that Israel had any complicity in the murders by Phalangists. Israel...never deliberately attacks civilians; this episode no more reflects Israeli policy than My lai reflected American policy. [emphasis added]

William Safire, NY Times, September 20 1982

It is also clear that the events in Skatila and Sabra took place within the view of one of the main Israeli observation posts in West Beirut.... the Israelis provided light from flares over the refugee camps while the Christian militiamen were inside.

Front page story, NY Times, September 20, 1982

Hampshire

continued from page 1

The administration's attitude towards SRI and the occupation was smooth and well thought out from the beginning, unlike the obnoxious and sometimes panicky behavior of the administrators at Wesleyan. From the outset, the Hampshire Administration took a non-confrontational approach, meeting the students on their grounds of open discourse and political action. When several other students marched to the Blair Hall Business Office three days later (where the administration had declared their temporary office), the President and the other administrators left the building as they saw them coming, unaware that the students had no intention of occupying.

Rather than being confrontational, the Administration sought to play politics with SRI. Both sides vied for support among the student body, the largest and most vocal sector of the community. This led to an exciting and unprecedented situation at Hampshire. With their bureaucratic functions temporarily on hold, the Administration spent all their time trying to gain a solid base of support. What resulted was a beehive of heightened political debate in which two or three campus mailings a day, pro and con, went back and forth between the administration and SRI. At the same time, SRI negotiated directly with the administration, which was much more serious and less inclined to petty bickering than the Wesleyan administrators had been.

Nonetheless, SRI activists are critical of the liberal, ambivalent positions of the administration. President Adele Simmons, for example, supports the Nuclear Freeze proposal, and has consistently acceded to the demands for expanding the Hampshire curriculum on disarmament. She discusses this in her recent piece on the Op-Ed page of the New York Times (8/12). Yet this article's title, "Teach National Security," is anything but unambivalent; and Hampshire students are quick to point out that Simmons is also on the board of American Telephone and Telegraph. ATT produces virtually all the satellite technology for the Defense Department, and is one of the corporations slated to be cut if Hampshire divests. Her dual position, says SRI spokesperson Warren Goldstein, expresses a clear conflict of interest. Her policy is to abstain in financial committee decisions. While the administration at Hampshire is more sensitive to social inequality, feminism, and corporate involvement in weapons production and sales, and is more open to student protest, the Hampshire situation is not completely incomparable to the one here. Wesleyan students should realize, however, that the administration here cannot be expected, from its past performances, to engage in an open, direct, democratic forum.

The Decision to End the Occupation

After several days of occupation and negotiation, it became clear that the university, for practical reasons, could not make immediate divestments. At the same time, the Administration was gaining ground in soliciting student support, primarily because students would not be able to graduate with the files unavailable. Some complained that they wouldn't be able to apply to graduate school or law school on time. So, in the largest campus wide meeting to date at Hampshire, the students voted 142 to 112, with thirty abstentions, to end the occupation. At the same time, support for the divestment demands was still extremely strong, with 278 of the 300 present in favor of the demand. (There were 16 abstentions and only two votes against the demands). Not only was this meeting attended by a huge percentage of the student body, but the Dean of Students, Michael Ford, and Adele Simmons were also there, and were both put on the spot by the entire assembly for not having made a stronger attempt to divest.

The Aftermath

SRI heeded the student vote and left the occupied building that evening, (May 21), just as the April 29 Coalition here at Wesleyan was having their wrap-up party. They left having achieved all of their demands except for immediate divestment and the proposals to restructure the Trustees' power over the university. A task force of students, faculty and administrators, with a financial advisor paid for by the university was set up to oversee a new investment policy. New feminist and anti-racist agendas were agreed to, the Alternative Learning Program was given top priority, and the occupying students were essentially pardoned, each one agreeing beforehand to having a written "warning" placed in their academic files. Overall, the SRI was extremely pleased by the action. Elizabeth Francis, one of the occupiers, stressed the democratic procedure of the whole action, a procedure which involved the entire community in large meetings for the first time in Hampshire's history, and said that the action had made "incredible connections" between feminism and opposition to militarism. As for the results, "I think it's been a success. I think we got some very concrete agreements from the president and from both the deans."

At the beginning of this school year, regaining the momentum that was lost over the summer seemed to be a problem at Hampshire, although an impressive 10 percent of the student body appeared at the first all-campus meeting this year concerning divestment. Divestment was a substantial issue at Freshperson orientation, and the task force will be spending this semester developing its proposal for reinvestment. Nonetheless, this proposal will have to be considered by the Trustees, and many Hampshire students anticipate more direct action. SRI is confident that the Hampshire

students will continue to be an ethical and political force on campus. And this is the key, this is the main truth that everyone has learned from the occupation, said Warren Goldstein. Student power is the bottom line, he said: "you can do anything if you have enough student support."

Three Final Notes of Interest

On the Final Vote to end the occupation: The figures in this vote were interesting, said Warren Goldstein, because it generally marked the split in the Hampshire community between the radical left and the liberal students, with about one half in the latter category voting to end the occupation. Yet, if the voting indicates that the politically concerned sector of the campus is split roughly in half, there is virtually no conservative element there; only two people voted against divestment.

Campus political organizations, said Goldstein, generally correspond to this half-radical, half-moderate make-up. Hampshire's "Community Council", (their equivalent to the Wesleyan Student Assembly) is rather conservative and did not support SRI. However, it has a much more limited legitimacy among the student body than the WSA does here; and a majority of politically active students work in their own smaller, democratic/consensus organizations which focus on particular issues such as disarmament, feminism, ecology, militarism, etc. These groups are united under the umbrella of the "Progressive Student Alliance" (PSA), a multi-issue leftist coalition.

On the Cost of Divestment: I quote from an SRI response to Adele Simmons concern regarding the divestment proposal and the "health of the college":

The...major concern over the proposed policy's implications for the "health of the college" is indeed the most difficult. There is a legitimate concern that the College may lose money in the process of selling its stocks even though the proposal urges that the securities be sold "at such a rate and in such a manner as not to financially endanger the College." It is also possible that the corporations which we choose not to invest in may take offense and refuse to give

Despite of the best efforts of Reagan, Edwards and Watt, the nuclear dinosaurs continue to collapse of their own weight. For example, a recent issue of *Barron's Investment Weekly*—no friend of the safe energy movement—put New Hampshire's Public Service Company second on its list of 52 utilities "at risk" because of nuclear investments.

The Clamshell Alliance is Still Around?

Yes, it is, and though it is not a vast New England-wide movement, it is still active and opposing the Seabrook nuke. They are now called Seacoast Clamshell and are based in Portsmouth, N.H. Their newsletter, *Seabrook Alert*, comes out six times. Subscriptions are \$4.

Sea Coast Clamshell
Box 1415
Portsmouth, N.H.
(603)-431-5942



graphic by Debbie Eagles

donations to the College. This however, does not seem to have been the case with the South Africa divestment. Our present guidelines do not allow investments in almost 400 corporations which operate in South Africa. The weapons proposal addresses itself to less than 70 corporations, 30 of which operate in South Africa, and hence are already excluded by our present investment guidelines. Will choosing not to invest in these 40 more corporations substantively jeopardize corporate gift giving?

On the Final SRI demand to Democratize the Power Structure of the Hampshire University: This proposal was a blockbuster put in by SRI at the last minute. It radically questioned the bylaws of the Board of Trustees, proposing that all affairs of the Board be opened to the Hampshire community: Students, staff, faculty, administration and parents. Specifically, it re-

quested that the Trustees nominate potential Board members to be approved by the Hampshire community, and that there be more community participation in Board decisions. Finally, it demanded that all decisions made by the Board be subject to veto by an all-community referendum.

This proposal was never seriously discussed by the Administration during the negotiations, and they were obviously unwilling to do so. In one meeting, President Simmons said that there were complex legal questions involved in the measure, and that the proposal was basically illegal (a point which many contend). But then where had direct democracy ever been anything but illegal? ■

Thanks to Elizabeth Francis, Warren Goldstein, and the Hampshire Daily Gazette.

Demonstrate to Stop the Arms Race



An invitation to you and your affinity group/organizing collective/peace community to attend a planning meeting and join in a coalition effort to produce a weekly presence at the Electric Boat shipyard in Groton, Connecticut.

The planning meeting is set for Sunday, September 26th from 4 to 6 pm in the Common Room of the Divinity School in New Haven, Connecticut. The meeting is called by members of the Feminist Union Anti-Nuclear Task Force and folks from Hartford's amorphous peace community.

Among the proposals that will be discussed at the meeting on the 26th is as follows:

*That specific preexisting groups take responsibility for planning and peopleing a gathering at Electric Boat one Monday out of each month on a regular basis;

*That there be coalition meetings attended by groups participating in this campaign to evaluate the previous month's activities and to plan activities for the next month, and that these evaluation meetings take place at least once a month;

*That the nature of the gatherings be reflective of our concern that the workers of Electric Boat come to understand why we are there, that they come to expect our presence and to know us as specific and individual people—that we develop a human relationship with the workers;

*That the groups participating in this campaign agree that the language and message in the series of leaflets given

out at Electric Boat each Monday be representative of the group as a whole; that we speak from a common base that we all establish and that we all are comfortable with; that we agree to put aside our sectarian language and forms of expression for this campaign;

*That the folks who will be present on each Monday gather at Norm's Diner at 6:00 am to meet with any extra people who come to join the primary group, and that the entire group proceed to EB for the gathering at 6:30 am; (And Help!)

There are 1-5 Mondays per month. We will need at least 4 groups (preferably 5), each group to take responsibility for one Monday per month. From September to December there is only one month with 5 Mondays (November 29th being the fifth).

Organized by the Norwich War Resisters League, Affirm, American Friends Service Committee, the June 12th Committee, Pax Christi, Covenant Peace Community, the Trident Nein Support Committee, and a number of unaffiliated individuals.

If you or your group are interested in participating in the campaign but cannot make the meeting on the 26th please contact Su Severo at 523-8243, or Joan Cavanagh at 776-4098. ■

Peace Rally at UConn

By John Ely

On Saturday, September 14th, the Students for Peace group at the Storrs campus of the University of Connecticut organized a long peace rally to protest the new militarism of the right in all its aspects. Throughout the afternoon, a hundred people or more listened to several speakers, as well as an eclectic group of folk and rock musicians.

This particular rally was interesting because of its multi-issue approach. There were speakers talking about the fight against registration and the various attempts to enforce it. One

major population center. Was this an action calculated to prevent innocent civilian casualties or merely small time genocide? Wattenmaker emphasized that these U.S.-supported acts of aggression are intrinsically tied to U.S. Foreign policy and to the military-industrial complex, particularly under the present regime. We must remember this in our attempts to oppose the arms race and the forced conscription. In this respect, he argued, the peace movement in the U.S. is a much different situation from the peace movement in Europe. To a much greater extent, the U.S. government is the source of the problems; and



spoke about disarmament and the local freeze movement; another made connections between racism, the draft and the volunteer army. The local organizer for Amnesty International, Barbara Rosen, talked about the "new right's" blind eye to issues of human rights, as well as particular successes the Storrs group has had in helping free prisoners of conscience.

Steve Wattenmaker, a senatorial candidate for the Socialist Worker's Party (Trotsky oriented Marxists) talked about his recent trip to Nicaragua. The Honduran army, he told us, financed to the tune of \$19 million with U.S. "Defense" Department aid (not to mention the 250 U.S. Marines assisting Honduran troops in actions on the Nicaraguan border) had recently attacked the only major oil tank in the country with newly rocket-equipped fighters. They missed the tank by 30 feet, he said. But had they hit it, many thousands of lives could have been lost, since the fuel tank holds several million gallons of petrol and is in the middle of a

given this central role, anything but the most holistic and the most radical (from the Latin "root") approach will only reinforce the very problems that one is trying to solve. It is not simply a matter of preventing one super-power nation-state's intrusive foreign policy and Pershing missiles.

Wesleyan student John Ely spoke on recent updates about Russ Ford. David Hume, public non-registrant from Yale spoke on his situation.

Overall, this was a successful peace rally, and it was encouraging for those Wesleyan students who went up there to see the organizing of other schools in the Connecticut area. We could not help noting, however, that many of the people at the rally were dissatisfied with the apathy and inactivity at the UCONN campus. The protest consisted of a tiny, but extremely vocal, minority of the student body; nonetheless, this group has organized a network between all the various schools in the Connecticut State University system, and puts out a consistent and excellent pamphlet. ■

John Ely '83 is a long-time anti-nuclear activist. His mother, Nancy, is a Presbyterian.

HERMES BELIEVE IT OR DON'T

This letter was recently sent out to the faculty as an agenda item at the September 21 Faculty Meeting. Hermes thought that the student body might like to see it also. It was dated September 14, 1982.

**To: Faculty Colleagues
From: R.K. Winslow, Professor of Music
Re: My motion to abolish student evaluation of teaching**

My reason for urging the motion rests in belief that evaluation of pedagogy ought to be rooted in institutional credo rather than student opinion. What does the institution believe? How well does the work of a teacher serve that belief? The present mechanism by-passes those questions and in so doing makes us the poorer, faculty and students alike. To gear pedagogy to immediate student taste is to imprison students in this immediacy.

Although some good comes from freely-expressed student opinion about a teacher's performance—e.g. the teacher gets feedback, the student exercises feelings—it seems to me that opinions, pro or con, invoke a dizzying range of factors including the narcissistic, the paranoid, and pre-learned tastes along with wisdom.

Students tend to like the present system on grounds that it provides a creative prerogative. I find this illogical.

I see no evidence that, since the extant system was established in 1967, pedagogy has changed for the better. Before 1967 we had brilliant teaching and so-so teaching. We still have that and probably always will have that. What has changed has been clarity of institutional purpose (without which, e.g., the term "little university" becomes meaningless). This has not been caused by using student opinion to judge pedagogy, but the mechanism weakens attempts to attain strong institutional posture.

There are creative ways for an administration to maintain awareness of faculty performance. The present way is, I think, debilitating. ■

Jim Sibbison, longtime public information officer with the Environmental Protection Agency, doesn't mince words in describing the "new" E.P.A.:

"In the past, E.P.A. officials at least tried to fend off corporation lobbyists and their friends in the White House, now these officials are little more than lobbyists working inside the government. In reviewing a corporation's case against regulation, the invariably fail to find any danger to health or to the environment. If a company thinks its product is safe or the pollution it generates is harmless, that's usually good enough. The only question seems to be how to say "Yes" scientifically."

Noting that most of Reagan's E.P.A. officials used to work for corporations that the E.P.A. is supposed to regulate, Sibbison describes the agency's new policy of heavy internal censorship:

"My first encounter with this censorship occurred when I reported in a news release that the pesticide dibromochloropropane (DBCP) was suspected of causing cancer and that there had been cases of sterility among workers who had handled it. Someone in the administrator's office (which reviews all press releases before they are disseminated) crossed out 'sterility' and substituted 'adverse health effects.' The reference to cancer was deleted."

"Soon after that, all references to cancer and hazards to pregnant women were purged from a draft or a news release about protecting workers from radiation. On another occasion, I proposed making public an E.P.A. finding that people using creosote and other cancer-causing wood preservatives should wear protective clothing. I was told not to bother. After a while, I simply stopped mentioning cancer, birth defects and damage to genes. As a colleague of mine says, 'The administrator's office will take the words out anyway.' But without references to those things, my news releases had little point."

—From The Nation, Sept. 11, 1982

Ahimsa



Ahimsa, a Sanskrit word meaning non-violence first used by Mohandas Gandhi, is also the name of the newsletter of Students for Peace. Published in concert by students from the Storrs campus of the University of Connecticut and Eastern Connecticut State College in Willimantic, this excellent tabloid is filled with news, poetry and artwork on all facets of the peace movement. Submission, subscriptions, inquiries and voluntary contributions can be sent to:

Ahimsa
c/o Students for Peace
Student Union
University of Connecticut
Storrs, CT 06268

Keep in touch with the peace movement at colleges in your region!

Ch... CH... Ch... Ch... Changes

Has the HERMES alienated you?

Many students feel the HERMES doesn't speak to them. We'd like to address this by defining our intentions for the coming year. We hope to expand our readership by encouraging a greater diversity of written viewpoint. (See accompanying diagram.) We plan to include more short, newsy articles on events both local and global while remaining a forum for theory and analysis. We also welcome fiction, cartoons, poetry, photographs, graphics, reviews and letters of a cultural and/or

political nature. Although we will not publish anything that insults or degrades minorities or women, we welcome debate and dissent of every variety.

The HERMES collective agrees that our society must undergo a profound change. Therefore we promote causes that consider people before profits and encourage individuals to take charge of their own lives.

So turn and face the strange. Read a copy of the HERMES with you entire face.

A Synopsis of Aid-Blind and Proper Channels

1979 September

Publication of A Planning Report for the 1980's (a.k.a. "Whitebook"). Its recommendations: 1) external funding should continue to finance at least 35 percent of the financial aid budget; 2) the average annual growth rate of unrestricted funds for financial aid should be limited to 15 percent; 3) if the above cannot be met, "a thorough reconsideration of the aid-blind admissions policy would be necessary."

1980 Spring

WSA and faculty reject Whitebook proposals. WSA demands retention of aid-blind.

1981 Spring

Use of unrestricted funds for financial aid has grown 46.8 percent. Budget Advisory Committee (BAC) is formed with four students, four faculty and three administrators to evaluate the university's capacity to retain aid-blind. Over 200 students participate in a two-day effort to stop work in North College for discussion of aid-blind and other issues. WSA and students again demand retention of aid-blind at all costs.

1982 January

BAC recommends 10 percent limit on the amount of operating budget to be used for financial aid. WSA and student body repeatedly object.

February 22

Trustees unanimously adopt BAC guidelines while students demonstrate outside meeting.

April 29

The 100-plus members of the April 29 Coalition

present Colin Campbell with a petition, signed by 1284. Its demands: 1) a return to aid-blind; 2) formation of a committee to study ways of financing aid-blind, its recommendations subject to campus referendum; 3) full voting rights for student trustees; 4) that Campbell and the trustees publicly voice the University's opposition to federal cuts in higher education.

Campbell rejects all coalition demands.

May 7

April 29 Coalition gives the President a letter restating the above demands and their commitment to them.

May 12-18

Four coalition representatives give President Campbell one more chance; he refuses to discuss demands.

22 students initiate 150-hour sit-in at North College. (Sit-ins are recognized by Wesleyan's Code of Non-Academic Affairs as a legitimate mode of student expression.)

Administration violates fire codes, denies access to bathrooms at sit-in for six hours.

Approximately 200 students support the action with leaflets, information sessions, press conferences, sitting-in on rotation.

600-800 attend rallies and information sessions. 1600 sign a petition of support.

The Administration acknowledged none of the demands made by students. The entire decision making process proceeded independently of student input. See next week's Hermes for a more in depth analysis of the issue and an update on current plans.

Editorials